

REMARKS

The examiner's communication dated February 26, 2004 has been received and carefully considered. An interview was held with the examiner and his supervisor on July 20, 2004. In conformance with the applicable statutory requirements, this paper constitutes a complete reply and/or a bona fide attempt to advance the application to final action. Specifically, claims 1, 4, and 6-8 have been amended and claims 2, 3, 5, and 9 have been canceled. In addition, detailed arguments in support of patentability are presented. Reexamination and/or reconsideration of the application as amended are respectfully requested.

The Office Action

Summary of the Office Action

Claims 1-6 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S. C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bock, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,417,868) in view of Borel, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,252,613) and Bock, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,271,820). Claims 7 and 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bock, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,417,868) in view of Borel, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,252,613).

Summary of the Interview

With respect to the present application, applicants greatly appreciate the courtesy examiner Leonid Shapiro and his supervisor Shankar Vijay extended to the applicants' representative in conducting an interview held on July 20, 2004, the substance of which is incorporated herein. The prior art discussed included Borel and both Bock patents, and no exhibits were shown nor were any demonstrations conducted. Generally, all of the pending claims were discussed. During the interview, applicants' representative presented arguments and/or suggested claim amendments concerning each of the discussed claims and, as will be further described below, the examiner indicated during the interview that the amendments to claims 1, 4 and 7 would be acceptable based on the cited art. Nonetheless, the examiner also indicated that a new search would be performed.

Concerning claim 1, applicants' representative argued that the cited references do not specifically show or describe the features of claim 1. Nonetheless, it was agreed that claim 1 would be amended to call for "at least one common sub-pixel" to overcome the prior art. Thus, claim 1 is essentially claim 4 without specifying the number of sub-pixel sets and the size of the superset.

Concerning claim 7, it was agreed that this claim would be amended to include "at least three sub-frames within a frame of said video data." Again, as with amended claims 1 and 4, the examiner indicated that the proposed changes to claim 7 were necessary to overcome the prior art.

Concerning claims 2, 3, 5 and 9, the examiner suggested that they no longer fit with claim 1, since the embodiment of Figures 4a and 4b does not include a common pixel among the sub-pixel sets. Thus, the rejection of these claims was maintained.

The Claims Distinguish Patentably Over the References of Record

As discussed above, claim 1, as amended, calls for each of said distinct sets to contain "at least one common sub-pixel." The cited references do not show this feature. Accordingly, it is submitted that claim 1 and claims 4 and 6, which depend therefrom, distinguish patentably over the cited art.

As discussed above, claim 7, as amended, includes "simultaneously addressing successive pairs of said rows for selecting distinct sets of a fixed number of said sub-pixels forming said pixel from a superset of said sub-pixels surrounding said pixel for each of *at least three sub-frames* within a frame of said video data." Again, the cited references do not show or describe this feature. Thus, it is submitted that claim 7 and claim 8, which depends therefrom, distinguish patentably over the cited art.

Claims 2, 3, 5 and 9 have been canceled. However in this regard, applicants' submit that the embodiments of claims 2, 3, 5 and 9 as shown in Figures 4a and 4b do, in fact, have a common pixel among the sub-pixel sets (the pixels comprise six sub-pixels, in a color display consisting of two red, two green and two blue sub-pixels), but they have only two sub-frames per frame, and, therefore, do not fit with claim 1, which recites at least three sub-frames per frame. Therefore, claims 2, 3, 5 and 9 have been canceled in order to advance the application to final action.

CONCLUSION

All formal and informal matters having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. It is believed that the proposed claim changes clearly place the application in condition for allowance, defining over any fair teaching (both structurally and functionally) attributable to the references. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that all claims remaining the in the application (claims 1, 4 and 6-8) are now in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

FAY, SHARPE, FAGAN,
MINNICH & MCKEE, LLP


8-26-04
Date


James W. McKee
Reg. No. 26,482
1100 Superior Avenue
7th Floor
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-2579
(216) 861-5582

Certificate of Mailing

Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.8, I certify that this Amendment is being

- ☒ deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class mail, addressed to: MAIL STOP AMENDMENT, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the date indicated below.
- ☐ transmitted via facsimile in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.8 on the date indicated below.
- ☐ deposited with the United States Postal Service "Express Mail Post Office to Addressee" service under 37 C.F.R. 1.10 on the date indicated below and is addressed to: MAIL STOP AMENDMENT, Commissioner For Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

Express Mail Label No.:	Signature 
Date <u>8-26-04</u>	Printed Name ELAINE M. CHELOVICH